

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/727,114	12/03/2003	Alexander Winker	82057	4410		
7590 09/21/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER		
KRIEGSMAN & KRIEGSMAN			SAETHER, FLEMMING .			
665 Franklin Street Framingham, MA 01702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			. 3677			
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

$\overline{}$		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)		_\\	
1		10/727,114 WINKER, ALEXAND		NDER			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Flemming		3677			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faill Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no evolution reply within the state riod will apply and will atute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tin story minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)[]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
,—	•	—— Гhis action is n	on-final.				
3)							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and ion Papers	drawn from co					
9)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b)	objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	* * * *					
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor The oath or declaration is objected to by the).	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been nents have been priority documereau (PCT Rul	n received. In received in Applicat ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachmer	nt(s)		_				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		O-152)		

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: since the specification is a translation for a foreign language it should be reviewed and revised to ensure it conforms to current U.S. practice which should include headings to the various sections.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example: In claims 1 and 14, "to be precise" is indefinite. In at least claims, 4, 8 and 12 there is no antecedent basis for "the edge". In at least claims 6, 7 and 13, there is no antecedent basis for "the step". In at least claim 8, there is no antecedent basis for "the step". In at least claim 10, there is no antecedent basis for "the surfaces". Claim 11 is indefinite because the sealing means is only between the locking means and cap. In at least claim 12, there is no antecedent basis for "the free region". In at least claim 13, there is no antecedent basis for "the sealing means". Lastly, in at least claim 15,

The claims were examined as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson (US 6,592,314). Wilson discloses a wheel nut comprising a nut body with a radial collar (12); a thrust washer (21) and a cap (40 [mislabeled 30 in Fig. 1]). There is a locking means formed as an inwardly bent free region (44) of a flange (43) connecting the cap, washer and body such that the body rotates relative to the washer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/727,114

Art Unit: 3677

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bydalek (US 6,435,791). Wilson does not disclose the locking means formed on the washer. Bydalek discloses a wheel nut wherein a locking means (32) is formed on an edge of a washer (16) and further shows a step (26) running around a nut body. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the locking means of Wilson on the washer and include a step as disclosed in Bydalek because Bydalek teaches the it to be equivalent to the current arrangement in Wilson (note Fig. 11).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Underwood (US 4,717,299). Wilson does not disclose a central recess. Underwood discloses a wheel nut wherein, as seen in Fig. 3, there is a central recess between a surface of a washer (13) and a surface of a nut body (6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a central recess in Wilson as disclosed in Underwood in order to reduce friction between the nut body and washer to facilitate relative rotation.

Claims 11, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shaw (US 4,295,766). Shaw teaches to provide a sealing ring (24) between a free edge of (11) of

Art Unit: 3677

a washer (1) and a flange (17) of a cap (3). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a sealing ring between the cap and washer of Wilson as disclosed in Shaw in order to prevent moisture from entering within the cap and corroding the nut body and stud.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Flemming Saether whose telephone number is 703-308-0182. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3677

Flemming Saether Primary Examiner Art Unit 3677